

Claims 11-14 and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 11-14 and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

With respect to the Examiner's comments regarding the expression "first judgment counter...has been judged", Applicants have explained the meaning of "setting a judgment counter is response to...", that is especially pointed out by the Examiner, in "expressing numerically" ([0053] paragraph), and further, as the setting method, set forth in concrete "the judging counter set in response to ... own travel path" – see specification, ([0026], [0055] – [0075] paragraphs, Fig. 4, S304, S305, S308). As to the Examiner's comments regarding the expression "judges evacuation", Applicants have amended the claims to recite "judging that the preceding vehicle is not traveling in front of the travel path of the own vehicle ([0073] paragraph, Fig. 4, S311).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection based on the present amendment and the presentation of the new independent claim 29.

Applicants respectfully submit that the object of the present invention is to increase the accuracy of the preceding vehicle recognition technique and in contrast, the Saneyoshi et al. reference has an objective to increase the accuracy of the image recognition technique and Saneyoshi et al. do not disclose any details of preceding vehicle recognition. Hence, Saneyoshi et al. neither disclose nor suggest any constitution of the third to eighth means set forth in new claim 29.

Dated: August 1, 2007

By _____

Edward J. Ellis
Registration No.: 40,389
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant